the general principles of the bill were acceptable to the House. On this account and in view of the fact that all the necessary details would be looked into by the Legislative Council, it was perhaps not necessary to print and supply copies to the members and to defer discussion.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** agreed in this view.

**Mr. H. K. MADIAH** said that it could not be said that details should be examined by the Legislative Council only. Representatives of the people should also have an opportunity of examining them in important cases and giving their opinion. In his opinion, it was necessary that copies of the bill should be supplied to the members.

**Mr. N. G. SANJIVIAH** said that since the year 1926, the general principles of legislative measures were not being explained in detail and for want of such details, the members were also not in a position to send up amendments. Thus, a valuable privilege was lost to the members. The bill under discussion was a new one and it could not be said that everyone knew its details. So, he wanted that discussions on the measure be postponed to the last day of the session, arrangements being made to supply the members with copies of the bill in the meantime.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** did not think it necessary to postpone the consideration of the bill. Besides there were as many as 8 members of the Representative Assembly in the Legislative Council who would look to the necessary details. As the measure was an urgent one, he agreed that it might be agreed to by the House.

**Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI** said that the Indian Partnership Act was already in force in British India and it was proposed to codify it in the State with certain verbal changes. The High Court had been consulted in the matter and their view was that in commercial matters the law in the State should be the same as in British India. He appealed to the lawyer-members of the House to explain the matter to their colleagues. This being an urgent measure, he hoped the House would accept it.

**Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO** said that the measure was a very necessary one. And because there was no law of this kind in force in Mysore, decisions of British Indian courts were being cited in the courts in the State and they were influencing decisions here. He therefore wanted that discussion on the measure might be postponed to the last day. In the meantime, attempts might be made to supply the members with copies of the bill. If that was not possible, the members would themselves look into the British Indian Act and be prepared for the discussion. He was sure that 90 per cent of the members would give their acceptance to the measure if copies were supplied to them.

**Messrs. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR** and **B. S. PUTTASWAMI** also shared the same opinion.

This request was granted by the President.

It was further agreed that the general principles of the other two bills on the Agenda be also taken up the following day.

## REPRESENTATIONS.

No. 1.—Appointment of a committee for the abolition of unnecessary posts in Government service.

MR. CHENNAPPA, Davangere Taluk and other members of the District.

**Mr. G. CHENNAPPA** represented that, with a view to reduce expenditure on all unnecessary posts in the service of the State, a committee of officials and non-officials be appointed to recommend suitable measures of retrenchment.

**Mr. Malur SUBBA RAO** supported the representation. He pointed out that there were certain unnecessary posts under the University and in the Education, Engineering and Railway Departments, which could be abolished without sacrificing efficiency. The generality of tax-payers had that impression and all of them felt that they could not bear the present high level of taxation. Personally he was aware of certain delicate matters which could be better explained to a committee than in an open Assembly. He therefore

prayed that a committee as prayed for be appointed.

**Mr. K. V. VEERANNA,** however, thought that a committee was unnecessary as it would entail unnecessary expenditure.

**The DEWAN** replied that Government were of opinion that there were at present no unnecessary posts and that the appointment of a committee as suggested was therefore not called for.

No. 2.—Revision of the scale of pay of officials of the Revenue Department.

MESSRS. M. LINGE GOWDA and S. KARIAPPA, Kankanhalli Taluk.

**Mr. S. KARIAPPA** represented that the scale of pay of officials in the Revenue Department be revised since they were not being paid for their labour adequately at present. They found it difficult to maintain themselves and their families with the small pay they received, with the result that on account of financial worry on one side and heavy work on the other, they could not discharge their duties efficiently. Sometimes, these poor officials were obliged to find other ways of supplementing their income by delaying papers and if possible receiving gratification from private parties. Several parties were experiencing difficulties on this account and it was up to the Government to remedy these by removing the root cause. The speaker was of opinion that if the starting pay of officials in the subordinate revenue offices was increased from Rs. 25 to at least Rs. 30, they might feel contented and this might result in quicker disposal of Government business.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** supporting the representation observed that unlike officials of other departments wherein the work of each official had been defined, the revenue officials were called upon to do any and every kind of work. Overwork and long hours had become a matter of course with them, even holidays were not enjoyed by them, and yet they were unable to cope with their work. The reasons for this were twofold. In the first place, offices were absolutely understaffed, and in the second, revenue work was steadily increasing. If the officials delayed papers, they would be heavily fined and thus their income would be further reduced. How then could they maintain themselves and their families? By underpaying a set of such hardworked officials, the Government themselves, it might be said, were indirectly encouraging them to become corrupt. In order to keep these officials above want, he requested the Government to consider the representation sympathetically.

**Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA** in opposing the representation, said that at a time when there was need for drastic economies in expenditure, it would be highly undesirable to incur extra expenditure. After all, work in district and taluk offices was not very heavy. The officials might remain in office overtime, but they really worked for only one or two out of the working hours. Officials of certain other departments, as for instance the Police, were able to manage with even lower salaries than those of the Revenue Department and so, in his opinion, there was no necessity for increasing the scale of pay in the latter department. If this was done, it would become very necessary to order similar enhancement in the case of all other departments, in which case the budget would show larger deficits than before.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** observed that there were no two opinions on the general question that officials should be given a living wage. And in accordance with this principle, the scales of pay of the establishments of revenue offices had been revised from time to time, each revision involving extra expenditure to Government. For instance, the minimum pay of the lowest grade of clerk in a taluk office not very long ago was Rs. 12. It was then raised to Rs. 15, again to Rs. 20, and now it stood at Rs. 25. Government were not unaware of the necessity of paying their establishments adequately. But it must also be stated, he said, that the mere addition of a few rupees to the pay of an official, if he was corrupt,

would not suddenly make him honest. Apart from this, any further revision of the scales of pay did not appear to be feasible, in view of the present financial condition of the State.

No. 3.—Reduction of Land Revenue.

MESSRS. D. S. MALLAPPA and SIVABASAPPA, Tiptur Taluk; G. K. MALLAPPA, Tiptur Municipality and SINGRI NANJAPPA, Minorities.

**Mr. D. S. MALLAPPA** represented that it was common knowledge that seasonal conditions were everywhere unsatisfactory throughout the State and that agriculturists were passing through very difficult times. This was one of the reasons why the extent of land under cultivation had decreased, as was stated by the Dewan in his opening Address to the Assembly. Even in the case of cultivated lands, remissions were not being sanctioned on an adequate scale and many of the agriculturists had to sell away all their belongings merely for paying *kandayam* during recent years. They could no longer bear the burden of the present level of assessment. The mover therefore prayed that a substantial reduction in land revenue be ordered in order to help the raiyats to tide over the present depression.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that it could not be said that everywhere the crops had failed and remission of assessment was called for. The rates of assessment had been fixed according to rules and until re-settlement fell due no general reduction could be ordered even in cases of failure of crops for some years together. Last year, no doubt, rains had failed; but there were sufficient rains during the present year. So, if at all, the question was one of remission for the past year. And for that year, remissions had been given on a liberal scale on the merits of each case. In these circumstances, Government did not find it possible to accede to the request for an all-round substantial reduction in land revenue.

**Mr. N. G. SANJIVIAH** said that the rates of assessment in the case of the Kolar District had been substantially reduced as a result of the recommendations of the committee appointed to recommend relief to the agriculturists. He requested that the rates of assessment in the Bangalore District be also reduced similarly.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** and other members from the Kolar District refuted the statement that the rates in the Kolar District had been reduced. MR. VEMA REDDY added that no relief had been afforded to the agriculturists in the Kolar District as suggested in the committee's report and requested that this be done at least now.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** represented that Bangalore District was worse off than Kolar District and prayed for some special consideration for the former.

**The DEWAN** replied that the representation related to permanent reduction of land revenue and not to grant of remission and that it was not possible for Government to accept it.

(NOS. 4 to 7 were not discussed as their subject-matter was the same as that of No. 3.)

No. 8.—Remission of *kandayam* on lands under *Talapariges*.

MESSRS. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA and G. SRINIVASIAH, Madhugiri Taluk and K. N. SIDDARAMA SETTTY, Madhugiri Municipality.

**Mr. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA** represented that while remission at the rate of 12 annas in the rupee was given last year in respect of lands under *talapariges*, this year the Sub-Division Officer had been sanctioning only at the rate of 6 annas in the rupee though the conditions this year were in no way better. He therefore prayed that remission of three-fourths *kandayam* for the year 1934-35 be sanctioned in respect of such lands, as in the years 1931-32 and 1932-33.

**Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA** represented that although the rains had altogether failed in the Sira and Madhugiri Taluks and the agriculturists there were entitled to remissions, the same had not been sanctioned.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that the Revenue Commissioner would enquire into the matter.

No. 9.—Remission of *kandayam* on bagayet lands.

MESSRS. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA and SORAPPA, Sira Taluk and SHEIK MOHADEEN SAB, Sira Municipality.

**Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA** prayed that where wet cultivation was carried on garden lands and the crops failed on account of insufficiency of water in the wells, remissions be granted in respect of such lands along with wet lands.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that if only wet and not bagayet cultivation was carried on those lands, the question of extending the concessions under the remission rules to such cases would be considered.

No. 10.—Cancellation of bagayet rates on dry lands containing wells.

MESSRS. T. SADASIVA REDDY and B. NARAYANA REDDY, Bagepalli Taluk.

**Mr. T. SADASIVA REDDY** represented that during re-survey certain lands containing wells sunk by the raiyats at their own cost had been classified as bagayet and the rate of assessment increased accordingly. This had been brought to the notice of the Government at a previous session of the Assembly and the Government had promised necessary relief. Since action in this respect had not been taken by Government, he prayed that only wet rates be levied in all such cases.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that he did not think bagayet rates were levied in such cases. The information of Government was that dry rates were levied on such lands. If, however, it was brought to notice that this was not so in any particular case, Government would take necessary action to remove the hardship.

No. 11.—Levy of permanent water-rate in lieu of temporary water-rate on lands irrigated by water of a Government *halla* which is not the source of supply to any *atchkat* or tank.

MR. PATEL MUNIAPPA, Harihar Sub-Taluk and other Members of the Chitaldrug District.

**Mr. Patel MUNIAPPA** stated that if an agriculturist wanted to use water from a Government *halla*, not being the source of supply to any *atchkat* or tank, he was not required under the rules to obtain permission from the Public Works Department. In such cases, there could be no objection to the revenue officials themselves giving general permission to a party to utilise the water. There was also no need to levy temporary water-rate for a period of five years in such cases. He therefore prayed that general permission be granted in such cases, a permanent water-rate being levied if the applicants so desired.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that a permanent water-rate could not be sanctioned, and that the correct procedure was to levy a temporary rate.

No. 12.—Concessions in the recovery of land revenue.

MESSRS. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B. GUNDAPPA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C. BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA and K. RAMANNA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHIAH, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA and B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

**Mr. DONDE GOWDA** represented that the concessions shown at present in regard to payment of land revenue, such as grant of time, waiving of notice fee, etc., had not been helpful to those who paid land revenue regularly, whereas they had benefited recalcitrants who, taking advantage of these concessions, delayed payment of Government dues for long periods. He therefore prayed that the *kandayam* be uniformly reduced at four annas per acre in the case of wet lands and at two annas per acre in the case of dry lands, so as to benefit all raiyats.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that the representation amounted to a percentage cut in land revenue and that it was not possible to comply with

the request. Each case of hardship would have to be examined on its own merits and necessary relief granted.

No. 13.—Remission of penal interest and the increase of the number of instalments of loan.

MESSRS. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA and K. SRINIVASIAH, Madhugiri Taluk and K. N. SIDDARAMA SETTY, Madhugiri Municipality.

**Mr. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA** represented that in Madhugiri Taluk the number of takavi loans had increased and the raiyats had committed default in regard to repayment owing to failure of crops and consequent inability to repay. He therefore prayed that the entire penal interest be waived and the number of instalments of repayment of loan be doubled.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that recently orders had been passed sanctioning the continuance of the reduced rate of penal interest on takavi loans for one more year from 1st January 1935. As regards the number of instalments he said that the parties must adhere to the rules in force, though in special cases of hardships Government would have no objection.

**Mr. SHANKARA SETTY** pointed out that even if the rate of penal interest was reduced it would not be possible for the agriculturists to pay it, since they could not even raise loans elsewhere owing to trade depression. He requested that penal interest be waived entirely.

**Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVIAH** represented that in Sira and Pavagada Taluks all the penal interest had been collected already. He requested that such collections be adjusted against the principal due as had been done in British India.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** replied that these suggestions would be sympathetically considered.

No. 14.—Reduction of interest on takavi and land improvement loans.

MESSRS. K. RAMANNA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B. GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C. BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHAIYA, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA and B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

**Mr. K. RAMANNA** prayed that the existing rates of interest on takavi and land improvement loans were very high and they be reduced to 4 per cent as a measure of permanent relief.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that the following concessions had been given :—

1. reduction of ordinary rate of interest on land improvement loans from 6½ to 5½ per cent ;
2. reduction of penal rate of interest on land improvement loans from 8 to 6½ per cent ;
3. reduction of penal rate of interest on takavi loans from 8 to 6½ per cent ; and
4. reduction of ordinary interest on takavi loans for one year from October last.

It was not possible to show any further concessions.

No. 15.—Excess collection of revenue to be returned immediately to the party or to be adjusted towards his *kandayam* of the ensuing year.

MR. V. VEERABASAPPA, Shikarpur Taluk.

**Mr. V. VEERABASAPPA** prayed that the land revenue collected from a *khathedar* in excess of the sum due for any particular year be either returned to the party or adjusted towards the *kandayam* for the year following even without application from the party, instead of being credited to the treasury as excess collection. He brought to notice that a very large sum of money was being collected in excess of the demand every year in various parts of the State.

**Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA** said that in certain cases, application for refund of excess payments might not be made for a long time due to ignorance and illiteracy of the villagers. He therefore prayed that such excess payments should not be declared as being barred by limitation.

**The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. N. Madhava Rao)** replied that cases of excess collections were not

very many. But if there were any such cases and they were brought to the notice of the Jamabandy officer, he could either sanction the refund or give credit on the application of the party. It was only in those cases where there were two or more parties to a claim that delay might occur. So, no special order providing for refund or credit appeared to be called for. He would, however, draw the attention of Jamabandy officers to the instructions already issued in the matter.

**Mr. K. V. VEERANNA** suggested that in the case of joint *khathe* lands, credit to the extent of the over-payments might be given to the *khathe* itself instead of waiting for applications for refunds from one or all of the *khathedars*.

**Mr. N. MADHAVA RAO** replied that he would examine that suggestion.

No. 16.—Lands to be brought to sale after the expiry of June in each year for arrears of land revenue.

MESSRS. M. RATTEHALLI RAMAPPA, Sagar Municipality and V. VENKATAGIRI RAO and D. K. VENKATAGIRIAPPA, Sagar Taluk.

**Mr. Rattehalli RAMAPPA** prayed that the lands on which arrears of land revenue were due should be brought to sale after June in each year for realisation of the sums due.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that if the representation was accepted, everybody would pay his dues only after June and the progress of collections would altogether be retarded. It was therefore not possible to grant the request.

No. 17.—Abolition of irrigation cess.

MESSRS. G. KANCHAPPA and MUMMADI H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA, Chiknaikanhalli Taluk and C. PATTABHIRAMA SETTY, Chiknaikanhalli Municipality.

**Mr. G. KANCHAPPA** prayed that the levy of irrigation cess be abolished in all the taluks where it had been made a separate levy during re-survey and settlement.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that irrigation cess was l for the maintenance of irrigation v All the cess collections were p together for this common purpos not earmarked for particular t Otherwise, it would not be possi restore or repair all breached t The subject had been discusse many occasions in the past an policy of the Government reite unequivocally. Government would again state, in accordance with policy, that it was not possib comply with this request.

No. 18.—Same as No. 17.

No. 19.—Abolition of irrigation cess and wet lands cultivated by rain water.

MESSRS. K. MANJANNA, Minorities; GAPPA GOWDA, Nagar Taluk and V. V. Shimoga Taluk.

**Mr. V. V. IYER** prayed that the of irrigation cess on dry and wet cultivated by rain water be abolish

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matt** pointed out that no irrigation cess being levied in the case of dry lan

**Mr. V. V. IYER** acknowledged there was some mistake in the repr tation as sent up by the D Commissioner's Office. He ther quested that the cess be not levi any rate in respect of lands for part of *atchkat* of any tank an which wet crops could not be gro any year owing to failure of rains.

**Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA** presented that in most cases ir malnad wet crops were raised only the help of water. He had no obje to the levy of irrigation cess on under tanks, but he did not thi justifiable to levy the cess in cases.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** replied that i not possible to abolish the irrig cess.

**Mr. V. V. IYER** then requested at least remission of assessmen sanctioned in the case of lands v were not irrigated by tanks an which wet crops could not be rais account of failure of rains in particular year.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** regretted it was not possible to do so either.

No. 20.—Levy of irrigation cess on *kushki bagayet* lands.

MESSRS. P. BASAVE GOWDA, Arsikere Taluk; A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B. GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA and K. RAMANNA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHAIYA, Holenarsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA and B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

**Mr. P. BASAVE GOWDA** prayed that the levy of irrigation cess on *kushki bagayet* lands not irrigated by tanks be abolished.

**The DEWAN** replied that it was not possible to abolish the cess.

No. 21.—Collection of mutation fees under the Record of Rights Rules through Sub-Registrars.

MESSRS. B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk; A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B. GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C. BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA and K. RAMANNA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHIAH, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

**Mr. B. DEVAPPA GOWDA** represented that at present mutation fees under the Record of Rights Rules were being collected through revenue officials. He thought it would be more convenient to recover such fees along with the registration fees in Registration Offices, through Sub-Registrars who might be authorised to do so.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that it was a good suggestion and the matter was already under consideration.

No. 22.—Exemption from affixing stamp to petitions presented for mutations in the *Hissa* Register.

MESSRS. PATEL PATTI BASAPPA and KAMAREDDI MALLAPPA, Molakalmuru Taluk and other Members of the Chitaldrug District.

**Mr. Patel PATTI BASAPPA** represented that in the preliminary list some names would be entered by the shanbhog, but later on, in preparing the final list, mistakes would sometimes creep in, for which the raiyats were by no means responsible. In such cases, if petitions were presented by raiyats for rectification of the mistakes, the officials would insist on the applications being stamped. The mover therefore prayed that instructions be issued to the effect that such applications were to be exempted from stamp fee.

**The DEWAN** said that the Revenue Commissioner would issue needful instructions in the matter.

No. 23.—Levy of fees for measurement of *phods*.

MR. PATEL MUNIYAPPA, Harihar Sub-Taluk and OTHER MEMBERS of the Chitaldrug District.

**Mr. Patel MUNIYAPPA** represented that the levy of Rs. 3 per *hissa* measurement in taluks in which the Record of Rights had been introduced was exorbitant. As such a high rate was not imposed even in Bombay, where also Record of Rights had been in force, he prayed that the fee be reduced to Rs. 2.

**Messrs. Channagiri RANGAPPA** and **L. VEMA REDDY** said that the request was reasonable. There was a mojinidar for each taluk, whose pay had been included in the establishment charges of the department. As such, the proposal would not involve the department in loss to any extent.

**The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. N. Madhava Rao)** replied that the preliminary stage of Record of Rights included measuring, assessing and mapping of *hisses*. All this meant very difficult and elaborate work and the fees collected would generally be just sufficient to cover the actual charges on account of all that work. It was therefore not possible to reduce the fees.

No. 24.—Recovery of measurement fee from both the *khathedar* who sells a portion of his land and the person who purchases it.

Mr. H. Doddalinga Naik, Hiriyur Taluk and other Members of the Chitaldrug District.

**Mr. Channagiri RANGAPPA** said that in the case of transfer of lands by sale, it was reasonable to recover the *phod* fee from the vendee alone with reference to the extent of land purchased by him. A *khathedar* disposing of a portion of his land would have no interest in such portion so that he should not be made liable to pay any fee for the measurement thereof. The speaker therefore considered it fair that *phod* fee be ordered to be recovered only from the purchaser and not from both the seller and the purchaser.

**The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. N. Madhava Rao)** replied that sometimes there would be transfers of land from A to B and from B to C. In such cases, two separate entries would have to be made and therefore two different levies. But in the case of all single transactions, only one fee would be levied. If it was brought to notice that in such cases also the fee was levied from both the seller and the purchaser, he would see that it was levied only from the purchaser.

No. 25.—Levy of upset price and fine in respect of dry lands when coffee or other crop is raised.

Messrs. Bagamane Deva Gowda and M. Siddalingappa Setty, Chikmagalur Taluk; N. M. Sivalingappiah and K. Thimme Gowda, Kadur Taluk; Hanji Basappa, Tarikere Taluk; M. S. Dyave Gowda, Koppa Taluk; K. Malle Gowda and M. Hutche Gowda, Mudigere Taluk; M. Thimmaiah, Tarikere Municipality; D. V. Halappa, Birur Municipality, and C. R. Nirvanappa Setty, Special Interest.

**Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA** said that it was the usual practice to levy both upset price as well as heavy fine in respect of dry lands on which coffee and other garden crops were grown. He prayed that upset price should not be collected in such cases in view of the large outlay incurred on the lands so as to make them fit for such cultivation, and that if at all the assessment on the land might be suitably enhanced.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that he did not understand why coffee rates should not be levied when coffee was grown on dry lands.

**Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA** said that if that view was taken, coffee rates might be levied only after the crop was harvested and that till then it was not fair to levy either a higher assessment or a heavy fine. That, he said, would mean a double penalty.

**The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. N. Madhava Rao)** replied that if coffee was grown only on *hiduvali* lands, fine or upset price would not be levied.

No. 26.—Appointment of a committee to examine the defects in coffee cultivation and trade.

Mr. C. R. Nirvanappa Setty, Special Interest.

**Mr. C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY** prayed that a committee be appointed with the Director of Industries and Commerce as Chairman to examine and remove the defects in coffee cultivation and trade.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** replied that there was a farm at Balehonnur to carry on experiments in improved cultivation of coffee and there were also several planters' associations for ensuring improvement of the trade. Besides, there was the Board of Industries and Commerce to which suggestions, if any, might be made by all those interested. In these circumstances he thought that a separate committee as suggested was unnecessary.

No. 27.—Reduction of rate of interest in the case of loans advanced to coffee growers.

Mr. C. R. Nirvanappa Setty, Special Interest.

**Mr. C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY** represented that the prices of coffee and arecanut which were the chief malnad products, were going down for the past two or three years, and particularly so this year. If this state of affairs continued, there was no doubt the coffee and arecanut industries in the State would suffer a serious

set-back and ultimately fall into the hands of foreign industrialists. He therefore prayed that besides establishing agricultural banks as in the western countries such as America, etc., penal rates and the overdue rate of interest of 9 per cent be reduced to the rates fixed under the revenue rules and relief given to the raiyats.

**Messrs. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA** and **MEER MAHOMED SAHIB** said that in certain cases repayments of loans fell due on 1st March. But the coffee crop would be ready for sale only at the end of March and sometimes in April, so that it was difficult for the planters to pay the instalments exactly on the due dates. In such cases, penal interest would be demanded not only for the period for which the instalments were overdue but for the full year. This was working as a great hardship and the members therefore requested that the relief prayed for be granted.

**The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari)** replied that certain concessions had already been given to growers of coffee and arecanut. He asked whether there was anything uncommon in demanding a penalty from defaulting parties. It was no argument to say that money was not available in proper time and that therefore delay should not be penalised. It was up to the parties to pay back dues in time if they wanted to save themselves the penal interest.

## ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

**The DEWAN** at this stage informed the House that he had received notice of an adjournment motion from certain members of the Assembly to the effect:

"That the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and recent occurrence, *viz.*, the reconstitution of the Executive Council of His Highness the Maharaja consequent on the retirement of Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan, the result of which will be the absence of a non-Brahmin Councillor in the Executive Council contrary to the convention and accepted policy of the Government."

He said that there were two resolutions (Nos. 7 and 15) on almost the same subject and so it seemed to him unnecessary to admit this adjournment motion. He, however, added that when those resolutions were taken up, the members might as well refer to the subject-matter of this motion.

**Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY** explained that at the time the resolutions were sent, members had hoped that the retirement of Mr. Matthan was due to take effect only in November 1935 and that therefore orders would not be passed before the Assembly had met and expressed its views on this matter of vital importance to a vast majority of the population of the State. But orders had been passed even before the Assembly had met and discussed the question and there would be no non-Brahmin Councillor in the Executive Council in the immediate future. This particular aspect of the matter, he said, could not be covered by the resolutions which had to be sent up many days prior to the meeting and it was feared therefore that when voting on those resolutions was taken up, this aspect might be ruled out as being beyond the purview of the resolutions. He therefore prayed that opportunity be given to the House to discuss this adjournment motion.

**The DEWAN** replied that notice of the resolutions had been given already and it would not be very proper to move and discuss an adjournment motion on the same subject-matter. He therefore regretted he could not allow the motion.

*The Assembly then adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 3-40 p.m.*

**No. 28.**—Holding in abeyance the preparation of the bill for amending the Mysore Village Offices Regulation as ordered in G.O. No. R. 223-37—L. R. 173-34-4, dated 10th July 1935, passing orders in regard to the abolition of the system of hereditary Shanbhogs and the substitution of a paid agency in its place.

MR. R. DASAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk.

*Summary of Representation.*

Many Shanbhogs are following their occupation hereditarily. If they are to be deprived of their *hak* all at once, it will be incumbent on Government to provide them with other suitable means

of livelihood. But this seems to be an impossible task. It is a mistake to say that Shanbhogs alone are the cause of creating party factions, etc., in villages. Patels are also responsible for this. The chief cause for all this trouble is due to 90 per cent of the existing Patels being illiterate. It is possible to remove all this trouble if only all the illiterate Patels are replaced by literate persons. Shanbhogs are fairly well educated. It is the clubbing of illiterate Patels with Shanbhogs that is the root cause of the unwise actions attributed to the latter. If educated Patels are forthcoming, there will be no room for such unwise actions and it will be possible to carry on the Government work in villages satisfactorily. Government have observed that, as the *potgi* paid to the Shanbhogs is not sufficient to maintain them, it is impossible to expect good work from them. To remove this evil, the remedy lies in giving them remuneration which may be considered adequate for the work expected of them. It is possible to meet this extra expenditure out of the amount that might be required to meet the emoluments of the stipendiary accountants proposed to be appointed in place of the existing Shanbhogs. If the registered *hakdar* Shanbhogs, who are fit to take up their work are only intent upon preserving their *hak* in the family without actually entering upon their duties, the rights of such persons may be forfeited and other competent persons appointed in their places. For these reasons, it is prayed that Government be pleased to hold in abeyance the preparation of the draft bill for amending the Village Offices Regulation on the lines of the Bombay Watan Act and that arrangements be made to take good work from the village officials by adopting the suggestion indicated.

*Not taken up as the mover was not present.*

**No. 29.—Forfeiture of *Shanbhogi Hak*.**

MESSRS. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B. GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C. BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHAIYA, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA and B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

**Mr. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY** prayed that in proved cases of Shanbhogs misappropriating Government moneys, the hereditary *hak* of the family be forfeited as a deterrent measure.

In supporting the representation **Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA** mentioned that some of the Shanbhogs were not issuing proper receipts for moneys paid by raiyats who, being illiterate, were not able to know what the receipts purported to be. Even where misappropriation was proved, the Amildars, instead of booking the Shanbhogs, were allowing them ample time to remit the collections, which, in his opinion, amounted to abetment on the part of such officers. Though the land revenue rules specifically laid down that all collections should be made by only Patels, the Revenue officers were not preventing Shanbhogs from receiving moneys. He instanced the recent case of a Patel in the Hassan Taluk handing over Rs. 300 to a Shanbhog who misappropriated the amount and was now being prosecuted. Unless stringent action was taken against all Shanbhogs who collected the moneys, misappropriations would continue. He therefore suggested that whenever a Shanbhog was convicted for misappropriation, not only should such a Shanbhog be deprived of his office but the hereditary claim of the entire family should be once for all forfeited. The present practice of punishing only the concerned individual was found to be too inadequate to prevent cases of misappropriation.

**Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA** said that he was aware of several instances of misappropriation by Shanbhogs. It was a very common feature among them to remit collections against the first *kist* only after the next or subsequent *kist* was collected. Thus they were cheating both the raiyats and the Government without the least compunction. It looked as though the practice

of misappropriation was also a family trait with most Shanbhogs just as their Shanbhogi office was enjoyed by them as a hereditary right. The practice of occasionally fining or placing a wrong-doer under suspension and entrusting his duties to some other member of the same family had not produced the desired effect. If, therefore, a fear was created in their minds that the entire family would be deprived of the hereditary claim in all cases of misappropriation, perhaps, they would behave better. For these reasons, he strongly supported the representation.

**Mr. K. RAMANNA** spoke against the representation on the ground that there was no general complaint against Shanbhogs as a class. It was not true, he said, that the bulk of them misappropriated Government funds, nor did he think that there were many members even within the Representative Assembly itself, who would support an accusation like that. It would be a glaring untruth, therefore, to say that all Shanbhogs were cheating both the Government and the raiyats by retaining in their own hands a continuous flow of Government moneys to the prejudice of either of them. It looked as though the allegations against Shanbhogs were due to prejudice on the part of a few individuals on account, perhaps, of the fact that about 5/6ths of the total number of Shanbhogs belonged to one and the same community; but the speaker knew full well that generally speaking, Shanbhogs and raiyats had none but the most cordial relations. Such being the case, it was a matter for the greatest regret that a few individual members of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council were persisting in bringing up before the two Houses questions calculated to prejudice the interests of one particular section of people and attributing to them motives, which was as unfair as damaging. Even if such questions were put to vote and carried by a majority in the Assembly, the result of voting, he was sure, would be due not to opinions honestly held but to undue influence and pressure brought to bear upon the majority by a few individuals. If these were not so, he failed to see the reason why anybody should complain only against erring Shanbhogs and seek to get them punished instead of complaining against all erring village officers. Was there one criminal law for Shanbhogs and another criminal law for Patels? Were not all people the same in the eye of law? Suppose, for example, a Patel misappropriated Government moneys, should he not be punished? Why, then, should the representation not say that there might be wrong-doers among both Shanbhogs and Patels and ask that all of them should be punished? No one could be opposed to all wrong-doers being suitably dealt with. If deterrent action appeared necessary, he for one would have no objection to forfeiture of the hereditary *hak* provided no invidious distinctions were contemplated. But the question was whether there was need for such drastic action? No doubt, some Shanbhogs, like some Patels, misappropriated Government moneys but more often than not, such things were due to absolute poverty and dire necessity. Both Patels and Shanbhogs, as a general rule, were phenomenally under-paid. If they were kept above want, they would also prove to be as honest as any other class of people. Personally, therefore, he was of opinion that if the scales of *potgi* were suitably revised it would put an end to all complaints against all village officers.

In conclusion, the member appealed to the mover of the representation and his supporters to view all questions with an open mind and a broad vision and not to make statements or do things which might result in creating splits and dissensions in rural parts and particularly among the credulous section of the illiterate masses.

**Mr. S. THIMME GOWDA,** who spoke next, supported the representation. He justified it by stating that it was as a result of the mischievous tendency of Shanbhogs that several lakhs of ignorant raiyats were put to untold misery and hardship. He did not agree with the previous speaker that the object of the mover of this representation was to suggest that only Shanbhogs and

not Patels should be punished. Nobody had said that erring Patels should not be punished. In fact, there were several Patels who were undergoing punishment for their own faults. Nobody had a grievance on that account. The real grievance was that the Shanbhogs, being clevérer men, were not so easily caught and very often they would manage to incriminate ignorant Patels for wrongs committed by themselves. He said that such cases had come to his notice in the Krishnarajapet Taluk, and he had reason to think that there were similar cases in most other taluks. This was the reason why stringent measures should be taken against Shanbhogs, a number of whom were habituated to misappropriate moneys and offend against both the Government and the credulous public

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** enquired if the mover could furnish statistics as to the number and proportion of Shanbhogs who had committed misappropriations so that he might judge for himself whether any drastic action as suggested in the representation was really called for.

**Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA** replied that some time ago the Government themselves had stated in answer to an interpellation that there were 100 such cases within a period of 3 years.

**Mr. K. RAMANNA**, interrupting, asserted that cases of misappropriations were many more in the case of Patels who were not merely prosecuted but actually convicted. He added that this was enough to show that there were bad men among Patels also.

Thereupon, **Mr. B. L. BYANNA** said that every village official—whether a Shanbhog, Patel, Toti or Talari—must be punished if he was found guilty of any offence. In that view, he could not support the representation since it referred only to one section of such officials. He added, however, that he would support the representation if it was made applicable to all village officers instead of to Shanbhogs only.

**Mr. S. C. MALLIAH** drew pointed attention to the fact that though under the orders of Government the Shanbhogs were not allowed to make any collections whatever, they persisted in collecting moneys and thus in offending against the rules. But that was not all. They also misappropriated Government moneys so that they committed a double offence. If it was so, he did not see why drastic punishment should not be given to them. He said that the charge that this representation was the outcome of communal prejudice was baseless since the Shanbhogi class consisted not merely of Brahmins but of several non-Brahmins including some Mahomedans. He appealed to the Government to consider the question from the point of view of the raiyats who paid their dues to Government with the greatest difficulty and consider whether it was not necessary to give deterrent punishment to those who misappropriated the moneys. He cited the case of a Shanbhog in Malavalli Taluk who had not maintained accounts for a period of 6 years and who was now absconding. The extent of hardship to which the raiyats were subjected by such village officials could be better imagined than described. For these reasons, he said that forfeiture of the hereditary *hak* of the family of offending Shanbhogs would be a proper punishment.

**Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA** also expressed the same views.

**Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO** explained that in many cases Shanbhogs were obliged to make collections because most of the Patels were illiterate. Till such time as all Patels became literate, it would be impossible to enforce the rule. Till then, simply because the Shanbhogs made collections, it would not be just to penalise them. There was too much exaggeration in the speeches made in support of the representation, against thousands of voiceless Shanbhogs. As this class of village officers belonged mostly to a minority community, he appealed to the Government to protect them against misrepresentation and villification by any section of the majority communities.

**Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO** was of opinion that the representation was

*prima facie* untenable. He could not agree, he said, whether in the case of a Shanbhog or of a Patel, to penalising the entire family for the sins of an individual member thereof. If such a thing was once recognised in principle, perhaps it would have to be extended to Government officials also. Would Government, he asked, agree to do so? Secondly, he did not see the justice of punishing only one set of people, exempting another set under similar circumstances. No civilised Government would do such a thing, because, all were equal in the eye of law. If the Mysore Government made that invidious distinction, it would be a most arbitrary and unheard of step. For the above reasons, he opposed the representation.

**Mr. P. SITHARAMIAH** agreed that whoever misappropriated Government moneys must be punished. One point that deserved examination was why the Shanbhogs should make the collections contrary to rules. It was perhaps due to the reason that in some taluks, Shanbhogs were being fined if a high percentage of the total demand was not collected and remitted at each *kist*. This showed that the duty of the Shanbhog did not end with the maintenance of village accounts. Another point that had to be examined was why the Patels were not doing the collection work as well as they ought to do. Perhaps, their illiteracy had something to do with it. But he was of opinion that whoever was entrusted with the duty of making collections, there were bound to be misappropriations among those performing that duty so long as they were not adequately remunerated. The main reason for misappropriation, he emphasised, lay in the fact that the village officers, in general, were ill-paid. If their emoluments were improved, he was sure that the corruption complained of could be put an end to gradually.

As regards the proposal to forfeit the hereditary *hak* of the entire family, he said that it would not be wise to accept it. Because, by retaining the present hereditary system, the Government would have a hold on the entire family and it might be possible to recover the moneys misappropriated by a Shanbhog from his sons or other heirs since they would be anxious to retain the office. If, on the other hand, the hereditary *hak* was taken away, moneys once misappropriated would be lost for ever.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** explained that the Village Offices Regulation did not provide separate rules for Shanbhogs and for Patels. There were common rules applicable to both. So, whatever new rules were framed would apply to both. The existing rule on the subject stated that if a Patel or Shanbhog was dismissed for serious defalcation, embezzlement of public money, or levying illegal cess from raiyats or fraudulent enjoyment of Government land, etc., his emoluments and privileges might be declared to be forfeited and would pass away from his family. In such a case, a divided brother having no interest with him might succeed to his office provided he was qualified under Section 81 (*b*). The representation under discussion, he took it, was for a tightening up of the existing rule on the subject so that cases of misappropriations might be minimised and those responsible for them might have something serious to fear. The Government were prepared, he said, to tighten up the rules accordingly but that it would not be possible to make separate rules for Patels as distinct from Shanbhogs, in this behalf, Unless the offence was a trifling one. Government would order prosecutions to be instituted; and if the party was convicted of the charge, forfeiture of the *hak* after dismissal would be the normal punishment. It would also be laid down that departure from this normal procedure could be made only under orders of higher officers. He added that orders to the above effect would be passed early.

No. 30.—Abolition of night watch in villages.

MESSRS. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA—and S. SORAPPA, Sira Taluk and SHEIK MOHADEEN SAB, Sira Municipality.

**Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA** represented that the system of night

watch by raiyats in the villages be abolished. The system had been abolished in all the British Indian Provinces as being antiquated. At a recent session of the Assembly, the Dewan had promised to take needful action in the matter in consultation with the Inspector-General of Police but action had not yet been taken to implement that promise.

**Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA** reminded the Government that in replying to this representation on the previous occasion, they had stated that if any village panchayat sent up a resolution for the abolition of the *kaval* system, it would be considered favourably. Speaking from personal experience of village life, he thought that there was no necessity to continue that system. Even at present it was being enforced only in a few places so that Government would be doing nothing very radical by accepting the representation.

**Messrs. M. C. LINGE GOWDA** and **T. MARIAPPA** spoke in support of the representation and said that the practice had resulted in more evils than good in the villages. It merely served to give a handle to the Patels to launch prosecutions against people whom they wanted to harass. Besides, it was causing a lot of inconvenience to most families. The system itself had become obsolete and it was unfair to enforce it in enlightened days when ideas of freedom and liberty were fast spreading. It was high time, they asserted, that night *kaval* duty was taken over by the Police Department even in the villages. The system of compelling villagers to do police work could not be justified.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** pointed out that the village *kaval* was the legitimate duty of the Talawar who was getting a *miras* from the villagers for this purpose. So, the raiyats had no obligation to perform it if they paid the *miras* regularly. Secondly, while people in the cities and towns were not bothered with such work, he thought it very unfair to impose it on the villagers. Since Government had already promised that the system would be done away with if resolutions to that effect were passed by the village panchayats concerned, he prayed that that promise be given effect to.

**The INSPECTOR-GENERAL of POLICE (Mr. F. A. Hamilton)** explained that during his tours in various parts of the State, he had made enquiries in different villages regarding the utility of the *kaval* system, and in no village did he find any one who was in favour of abolition of the system. But he was surprised to find that every member of the Assembly who had just then spoken on the subject was entirely opposed to the impression he had gathered while out in the villages. In his opinion, the existing system was a very valuable one. In this connection, he wished to bring to the notice of the House an opinion which, unfortunately, none of the members seemed to hold and one which many of them seemed to be unaware of, namely, that every citizen in the State was a potential policeman and as such, it was his duty to protect his own and other peoples' properties. After all, the Police were paid instruments of the people. If they did not have a *kaval* in every village, then they would be required to do one of two things: either to increase the regular police force or increase the village police force. He had attempted to make an estimate of what the cost would be in each village if the *kaval* system was to be abolished and additional police force was established and found that the revenue of each village would have to be increased by 20 to 30 per cent. He added that if the people were willing to pay that amount in order to be relieved of the *kaval* system, it would be well and good; but he was afraid that people were not prepared to undertake such a heavy responsibility.

MR. HAMILTON admitted that there might be certain members in different villages who were unwilling to serve as *kavaldars*. But simply because the system was in vogue, it did not mean that the person should personally serve. He could always, if he wished, find a substitute. As to the incidence

Karnataka State Archives
(Departmental Library)
4680
Accession No.

of service, he explained that it varied in different villages and according to the population. Ordinarily, no one would have to serve more than once a week sometimes the turn came only once in a year. This, MR. HAMILTON thought, was not a very heavy duty for any citizen of the State to perform. As regards the reference made by certain members to the non-existence of the *kaval* system in British India, he said that it was quite true that there was no regular *kaval* system there. But the Village Police in British India were more numerous than in Mysore and were capable of undertaking the duties that villagers were, in Mysore, required to do under the *kaval* system. Moreover enquiries made regarding the Chittoor District showed that when the presence of criminals was suspected, Police and Revenue officials formed parties of villagers to make raids and capture criminals. Such parties were formed of volunteers. The opposition to the retention of the *kaval* system tended to show that the voluntary performance of similar duties in Mysore would be difficult to achieve. Yet it was essential that the villagers must have some substitute if the *kaval* system should be abolished.

For these reasons, he did not think it would be possible to abandon the *kaval* system unless the people were prepared to find the wherewithal for the appointment of substitutes. And if they were prepared to do so and brought forward a proposition to that effect, he had no doubt that Government would be pleased to consider the suggestion on its merits.

**Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR** remarked that in his opinion, the reply of the Inspector-General of Police was not satisfactory to members, nor did it appear to have been conceived in public interest. The grievance of the villager was that after the day's hard toil, it would be too much to expect him to abandon his home, sleep in the dilapidated village *chavadi* or keep going about the village on watch duty. It was a matter for surprise that the Inspector-General of Police who knew full well that the system had been abolished long ago in British India should have advocated its perpetuation in Mysore. The Inspector-General had to his credit some small reforms brought about in the Mysore Police and the speaker desired that the night watch system might also be abolished as a measure of reform. The villagers were being prosecuted and subjected to considerable harassment in some places for failure to perform this duty. This system was antiquated and not in vogue in any civilised country. The Mysore administration had copied several improvements from British India and, he thought, they would do well to go by the British Indian example in this matter also. Even in the case of compulsory weekly labour, no penalty was attached for default but in the event of failure to do night *kaval* duty, people were being unduly harassed by the Patels.

It was high time, he said, that the said duty was transferred to the regular police. If necessary the force might be specially strengthened from year to year under a 5-year or 10-year programme, in case funds did not render this possible all at once.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** reminded the speaker that even under the existing orders, any person could be called upon to serve as a policeman in case of necessity.

**Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR** thereupon asked "Supposing every resident of Bangalore and Mysore Cities was similarly called upon to do night *kaval* work in the cities, without any exception whatever, how would the highly educated and well-placed residents feel in the matter?" He also brought to notice that it had not been noted in the Night Kaval Rules how many hours' previous notice should be given to those who were called upon to do *kaval* duty.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** explained that there was a *kaval* register in each village and that any defects in the system could be rectified by amending the existing *kaval* rules, providing for adequate notice being given to parties about their *kaval* duties.

**Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR** however concluded with a request that the antiquated, obsolete and almost barbarous system of night *kavals* be immediately abolished.

**Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVAIYA,** speaking again, observed that the regular police allowed to the villages were doing really no work at all. This was one of the reasons why the night *kaval* system was still kept on voluntarily in some of the villages. Most of the cases detected were generally due to the efforts of the villagers themselves. This showed that when there was actual necessity, the villagers could rise to the occasion and did not need to be forced to do the night *kaval* work as a matter of routine. The inconveniences complained of were genuine. In many villages the *chavadies* were leaky and people could not get shelter on rainy nights. He did not think that any elaborate argument was required to make out a case for the abolition of the system and no administrative inconvenience was going to be caused by its abolition.

**Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA,** in further supporting the representation, stated that in the malnad where wild beasts were causing a lot of damage to life and property, the villagers could undertake this work only at the risk of their lives.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** said that the system was not in vogue in the malnad where residential quarters were separated by considerable distances.

As regards the maidan districts, Government were inclined to defer to the opinion of the Inspector-General of Police who was an officer of considerable experience.

**Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA** remarked that it was far from creditable that Mysore should keep on this obsolete form of compulsory watch duty and begged of the Government to abolish it forthwith.

**The DEWAN** said that Government would further consider the opinions expressed by both the members and the Inspector-General of Police and pass suitable orders if a change in the existing practice appeared necessary.

No. 21. *Miras* to *Totis*.

MR. N. HANUMANTHAPPA, Minorities.

**Mr. N. HANUMANTHAPPA** represented that the *totis* who had to attend to both Government and village duties were not regularly paid their *miras* of 3 seers an acre while the Patels and Shanbhogs were regularly receiving their dues. He prayed that proper arrangements be made so that the *totis* might receive the *miras* regularly.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan)** observed that it would not be right for the villagers to refuse payment of *miras* to *totis* and *talaris* and that the aggrieved parties could surely obtain redress by petitioning the Amildar. Such petitions need not even be stamped and so the remedy could be obtained very easily.

**Mr. N. HANUMANTHAPPA** prayed that power might be given to the Revenue Inspector to make the villagers pay the *miras* as thereby redress could be had more easily and promptly.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** replied it would not be advisable to give that power to Revenue Inspectors but that the Amildars would enforce the rule if individual cases were taken to their notice. He also promised that Government would cause circular instructions to be issued again to all Amildars that they should give their personal attention to the matter.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** brought to notice that if some of the village servants were not receiving their *miras* regularly, it was because they were not rendering service to the villagers. These servants had a wrong notion that they were answerable only to the Government and not to the villagers. Unless they were made conscious of their obligatory duties to the people, as prescribed in the Village Offices Regulation, Government would not be justified in insisting on the payment of *miras* by the raiyats. He therefore suggested that in the circular proposed to be issued by the Government, pointed attention should also be drawn to the proper discharge of duties by the village servants which should be a condition precedent to payment of *miras*.

**Mr. K. MATTHAN** explained that there never was an idea that *miras* should be paid even if the *totis* did not perform their duties. And if any village servant failed in his duty, it was open to the people to bring it to the notice of the revenue officers and get him dismissed for it but that it would be irregular for the villagers to take the law into their own hands and withhold the *miras* due to him.

*The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m. to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.*

---

THIRD DAY.

*Thursday, 10th October 1935.*

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—
(*contd.*)

### Misappropriation of Land Revenue Collections in the Mandya Sub-Division.

**Q.—12. Mr. T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA** (Nagamangala Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) how many cases of misappropriation of land revenue were reported from Mandya Sub-Division Office during 1933-34 and 1934-35 ;

(*b*) (i) how many cases ended in conviction after due enquiry ; (ii) how many cases were let off for want of evidence ; (iii) what was the expenditure incurred by Government on these cases ;

(*c*) (i) of the persons against whom cases were instituted, how many were Patels and how many were Shanbhogs; (ii) of those convicted, how many were Patels and how many were Shanbhogs ; (iii) who was in charge of the office during that period ?

**A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).—**

| | | 1933-34 | 1934-35 |
|---|---|---|---|
| (*a*) | | 3 | 4 |
| (*b*) | (i) | ... | ... |
| | (ii) | 1 | ... |

(iii) No expenditure was incurred in this department.

| | | 1933-34 | 1934-35 |
|---|---|---|---|
| (*c*) | (i) | 3 Shanbhogs | 1 Shanbhog<br>3 Patels |
| | (ii) | ... | ... |

(iii) Mr. V. Vedavyasacharya, B.A., was in charge of the Sub-Division till 12th November 1933 and Mr. E. V. Ganapati Iyer since 13th November 1933.

**Mr. T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA.**—With reference to answer to (*a*), is it not a fact that there are about 14 cases of misappropriation of land revenue ?

**Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.**—The information received from the Deputy Commissioner is that there were only 7 cases.

**Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.**—With reference to answer to (*b*) (ii), what happened to the other six cases ?

**Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.**—Evidently they are pending.

**A Member.**—What was the total amount misappropriated ?

**Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.**—Notice.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA.**—Have any steps been taken to recover the amounts ?

**Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.**—The Deputy Commissioner says that steps are being taken.

### Acquisition of houses in the Agraharam in Chamarajanagar.

**Q.—13. Messrs. B. S. PUTTASWAMY** and **SIDDAPPA** (Nanjangud Taluk) ; **K. C. SUBBANNA** (Chamarajanagar Taluk) and **Patel BASAPPA** (Gundlupet Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) when was the order passed to acquire the *agraharam* houses in front of the Chamarajeswara temple at Chamarajanagar ;

(*b*) were the houses acquired, taken possession of after the payment of compensation, or were they taken possession of without paying compensation, and demolished, and the materials auctioned ;

(*c*) was the compensation amount fixed before taking possession ;